



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PATRONYMICS AS A TEST OF THE RELATIVE AGE OF HOMERIC BOOKS

BY JOHN A. SCOTT

Wilhelm Meyer in his dissertation *De Homeri Patronymicis*, Göttingen, 1907, confidently assumed the ability of marking off the different Homeric strata by the varying use of patronymics. This work was most favorably reviewed by K. F. W. Schmidt in the *Berliner Phil. Woch.*, 1907, 993; was immediately placed among the authorities in Christ-Schmid *Griech. Lit. Gesch.*⁵ 32, and p. 35 in the next edition, each edition containing a footnote voicing approval, and it has also, with slight reservation, been adopted by Professor Cauer in his *Grundfragen*², p. 150, where this high praise is given: "Die Dissertation verdient allen Dank für die Vollständige und klare Darlegung der Verhältnisse." Meyer's results, as given in his own summary, are briefly as follows (p. 66): "Ut in Iliadis recentibus partibus ita in tota Odyssea patronymicorum usus rarescere incipit. Etiam in multis aliis rebus inter Iliadis et Odysseae stilum discrimen haud ita parvum interesse satis constat. Ergo ex eis quoque, quae de usu patronymicorum in Iliade et in Odyssea enucleavimus, concludendum est inter haec duo carmina intervallum satis multorum annorum interesse." If this be true it should go far to answer any arguments in favor of unity of authorship, but in this matter the simple fact of comparative numbers is of little importance, since in such scenes as concern Calypso, the Cyclops, Circe, or Eumaeus, patronymics are obviously not to be expected. The whole question then is one of sphere; this sphere is as follows:

1. Patronymics are especially used to confer dignity or honor, as the following proofs will show; Scholiast to B 23: ἡ πατρωνυμία τοὺς εὐγενεῖς ἥδει; Agamemnon advised his brother to salute the leaders:

K 67 φθέγγεο δ', ἣ κεν ἴησθαι, καὶ ἐγρήγορθαι ἄνωχθι,
πατρώθεν ἐκ γενεῆς ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον,
πάντας κυδαίνων.

True, as Meyer and Cauver emphasize, the suitors are of princely stock. The poet must concede this, since men of low birth could not presume to seek the hand of Penelope. But he creates no currents of respect or sympathy in their behalf. The leaders are uniformly coarse, cruel, and vicious, so that there is no pity when Antinous is shot without warning, and none when Eurymachus immediately meets a similar fate. The hearer assents when Odysseus calls them "Dogs," and approves the merited punishment which follows. After the leaders have fallen and external help is despaired of, the suitors show the bravery of hopelessness, rallying for a brief and heroic struggle. Here their bravery is rewarded by the use of patronymics (χ 241): Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος also Πείσανδρος Πολυκτορίδης. This might well pass for a description from the *Iliad*, since the use of the patronymic is identical with that found there in similar scenes. It is most significant that on the one occasion in which the suitors show any traces of heroism they are given this honoring title.

Meyer says of Ctesippus (p. 63): "Ctesippus, qui 6 locis comparet, semel patronymico appellatus est nomine proprio non addito: ubi introducitur patronymicum deest." Ctesippus is given the patronymic (χ 287): ὁ Πολυθερσείδης, which is patronymic in form only, and instead of being a mark of honor is a term of severest reproach. Homer never joins the interjection to the true patronymic, as I have elsewhere shown: *A.J.P.*, 1903, 192. Then the rendering is not, "Thou son of Polytherses," but "Thou child of insolent rashness." This word is of the same formation as Thersites, both being derived from *θέρσος*, the Aeolic form of *θάρσος*. The words *Θερσίτης* and *Πολυθερσείδης* carry in themselves the proof of a common origin. It was clearly the purpose of Homer to picture the suitors as meriting an ignominious death. They were accordingly to have but little part in the honor conferred by a patronymic; yet they were not entirely excluded, since where they showed bravery the patronymic was used. Also when Agelaus urged the suitors (υ 321) to use decency and refrain from insulting either stranger or servant, the poet showed his own appreciation of this sense of justice by calling him Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος. The only possible conclusion in regard to the use of patronymics when addressing or

referring to the suitors is that they belong, as a whole, to that class which the poet considers unworthy of honor, but when any one of them shows bravery or a sense of justice the poet may voice his appreciation by using the patronymic. This is in the strictest harmony with the ethos of the patronymic as shown in the *Iliad* and is a strong proof of identity of authorship.

2. A second principle and one similar to the first is that patronymics give dignity and impressiveness. When the fighting begins in Δ, Ares leads one side, Athena the other, and an added impressiveness is obtained by the frequent use of patronymics; the first to be slain is *Θαλυσιάδης Ἐχέπωλος*; *Ἐλεφήνωρ Χαλκωδοντιάδης* tries to spoil the corpse and was the second to fall; the next victim was *Ἀνθεμίδης Σιμοείσιος*, whom *Ἀντιφός Πριαμίδης* seeks to avenge. This solemn or impressive use of patronymics is most strikingly exhibited in the description of the death of Patroclus; when Patroclus is just at the point of being slain he is named *Πάτροκλος Μενoitιάδης*; then when Euphorbus strikes the blow he, Euphorbus, is called *Πανθοίδης Εὐφορβος*, and Hector, so rarely given a patronymic, as he makes the final thrust is named *Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης*. There is but one scene in the *Odyssey* to compare with these—that in which the suitors attempt their own defense—and there the patronymics are used in the same manner as they are in kindred passages of the *Iliad*.

3. When a person of patronymic rank or merit is frequently mentioned or when several such persons are brought on in groups the patronymics and other forms interchange in order to give variety to the diction or meter, e.g., E 76: *Εὐρύπυλος δ' Ἐναιμονίδης*; 79: *Εὐρύπυλος Ἐναιμόνος ἀγλαὸς υἱός*; E 108: *Καπαηίου υἱόν*; 109: *Καπαηιάδης*; 111: *Σθένελος*. How acute Homer's sense or feeling for variety was is shown by the fact that in a single book, *Iliad* v, Diomedes is referred to or addressed by each of the following methods. They are quoted in the form and in the order in which they appear: *Τυδείδῃ Διομήδῃ*, *Τυδείδῳ*, *μεγαθύμῳ Τυδέος υἱός*, *βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης*, *Διόμηδες*, *κρατερὸς Διομήδης*, *Τυδείδῃ δαΐφρονι*, *δαΐφρων Τυδέος υἱός*, *καρτερόθυμῳ δαΐφρον ἀγαυοῦ Τυδέος υἱέ*, *Τυδέος υἱὸς ὑπέρθυμος Διομήδης*, *Τυδέος υἱός*, *Διομήδεος ἵπποδάμοιο*, *τὸν ἄνακτα*, *Τυδέος ἔκγονος δαΐφρονος Οἰνείδαο*, *Διομήδεα δῖον*, *Τυδέος υἱὸν ὑπέρ-*

φίλον Λιομήδεα—16. This love for variety of expression explains the difficulty discovered by Meyer (p. 16) where discussing the manner in which Agamemnon is addressed he says: "Saepius nudam patronymici formam Ἀτρείδη legimus, semel autem nihil nisi Ἀγάμεμνον B 362, quod valde mirabile est neque aliter excusari potest, nisi quod versus recentissimus est." This criticized form of address is found in the speech of Nestor in which he urges upon Agamemnon a general plan of military tactics; Nestor has already called him in this speech, Ἀτρείδη, σύ, and ἄναξ, so to avoid repetition he now chooses another word. Nothing could be more Homeric nor more in keeping with the character of Nestor; for if the simple proper name be lacking in deference, yet the mere fact of giving advice assumes superiority in the matter advised. The desire to vary the manner of address and the tone of the speech fully explain any deviation from the normal. Not only does the manner in which single persons are addressed or mentioned constantly shift, but when groups are introduced there is a similar diversity of epithet, e.g.:

E 703 ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξαν
 Ἐκτωρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς καὶ χάλκεος Ἄρης;
 ἀντίθεον Τεύθραντ', ἐπὶ δὲ πλῆξιν πον Ὀρέστην,
 Τρῆχόν τ' αἰχμητὴν Αἰτώλιον Οἰνόμαόν τε,
 Οἰνοπίδην θ' Ἑλεον καὶ Ὀρέσβιον αἰολομίτρην.

Here in four verses eight characters are named as present in the battle, each has a peculiar mark of individualization, and although each is given a different attribute but one has a patronymic. There can be little doubt that the needs of poetry and meter decided the choice. Such groups abound in the fighting scenes of the *Iliad*, but are necessarily rare in the *Odyssey*. There is but one parallel and that is found in the list of the Phaeacians who gathered to witness or participate in the games, θ 111-16:

ὄρτο μὲν Ἀκρόνέως τε καὶ Ὠκύαλος καὶ Ἑλατρεὺς
 Ναυτεὺς τε Πρυμνεὺς τε καὶ Ἀγχίαλος καὶ Ἑρετμεὺς
 Ποντεὺς τε Πρωρεὺς τε, Θόων Ἀναβησίνεως τε
 Ἀμφιάλός θ', υἱὸς Πολυνήου Τεκτονίδαο
 ἃν δὲ καὶ Εὐρύαλος, βροτολογίῃ ἴσος Ἄρηι,
 Ναυβολίδης.

Twelve persons are here named as present. Homer in this passage shows his remarkable ability in coining names derived from the sea or navigation, each patronymic adds to the task, but, even so, in this list two patronymics are found. The similarity between the use of patronymics in this passage and the one quoted from E can escape no one.

Next there will be considered some of the arguments advanced by Meyer for testing the antiquity of individual passages (p. 45): "Ubicunque *νίός* legitur, locus est recens." Meyer then compares passages which he regards as early with those he regards as late, showing the early passage has the patronymic while the late one has *νίός*; e.g., E 76: *Εὐρύπυλος Ἐναιμονίδης*, cited as an early phrase in the old stratum; B 736: *Εὐρύπυλος Ἐναιμόνος ἀγλαὸς νίός*, cited as a late phrase in a late stratum. This looks convincing, if one does not open his Homer: "Fling but a stone, the giant dies." The full passage in the old stratum is as follows:

E 76 *Εὐρύπυλος δ' Ἐναιμονίδης Ὑψήνορα δῖον,
νῖόν ὑπερθύμου Δολοπῖονος, ὃς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου
ἀρπηγὴρ ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὥς τίετο δῆμψ,
τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Εὐρύπυλος Ἐναιμόνος ἀγλαὸς νίός.*

Why go back to the Catalogue of the Ships? In the very sentence he quotes to prove E is old, are two examples of the thing he quotes to show B is late—not only two examples, but the identical phrase. The subject then belongs to one poet, and he is early, the object to another, who is late, while a third poet completed the sentence. Who wrote the verb? Was it the work of the poet who wrote the subject, the poet who wrote the object, or the poet who completed the sentence? "Soll die Homerkritik abdanken?"¹ is the title of a scornful article written by Professor Cauer against Professor Rothe. The answer is to be found in Cicero *In Catilinam* i. 5: "Interrogas me, num in exilium; non iubeo, sed, si me consulis, suadeo."

The Catalogue abounds in patronymics, e.g., 541: *Χαλκωδοντιάδης*; 566: *Ταλαιονίδης*; 577: *Ἀτρείδης*; 622: *Ἀμαρυγκείδης*; 624: *Αὐγηιάδης*; 628: *Φυλείδης*; 653: *Ἡρακλείδης*; while on the other hand such radical critics as Robert, Bechtel, Fick, and Christ

¹ *Neue Jahrbücher*, 1912, pp. 98 ff.

do not scruple to assign A 9: *Ἀητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός*, to the earliest stratum of the *Iliad*, and however much they may shift the form of the words no one of them omits the verse or prints a substitute for *υἱός*.

As evidence for the lateness of the *Odyssey* Meyer observes (p. 62) that the son of Menelaus, Megapenthes, even if named five times, is never given the patronymic. Megapenthes according to Homer was born of a slave, hence an example of Meyer's own rule (p. 33): "Spurii semper carent patronymico."

P. 56: "Alter Ajax, qui in Iliade patronymicum habet, in Odyssea duobus locis occurrit, neque tamen patronymicum legitur." In the *Odyssey* Ajax Oileus is no hero, but a reviler of the gods who died from "drinking salt-water." To have applied a patronymic to him in this passage would have been most incongruous.

P. 62: "Deiphobus who has a patronymic in the *Iliad* though mentioned twice in the *Odyssey* is each time without it." Deiphobus is mentioned in the *Odyssey* solely from the Greek side and then apparently as the successor of Paris in the affections of Helen, so was too despicable in their sight for them to honor him with a patronymic.

P. 48: "Notandum est neque Dolonem neque regem Rhesum patronymicum habere; sed quia uterque ex recentissimis partibus est, eius rei causam non ignoramus." Dolon was a coward and a traitor, one of the least heroic characters in Homer, who could have no share in that honoring title; as for Rhesus, this is no mark of lateness, since the Trojan allies have very few patronymics, Glaucus has none, Sarpedon none, and Pandarus none. That the absence of the patronymic is in itself no mark of the late appearance of a character in the tradition is shown by the fact that Paris is never given a patronymic, yet Paris and Helen must have had a place in the earliest conceptions of the *Iliad*.

P. 45: Meyer quotes from Ψ the names of four persons who have no patronymic, Clysonomus, Clytomedes, Epeius, and Eumelus, drawing this conclusion: "Locos, quos enumeravi, recentissimos esse nemo negat; ergo optime confirmantur quae iam observavimus, scilicet patronymicum in recentioribus Iliadis partibus rarescere." This is the essence of the entire subject, and so I shall compare the

book, A, which he assumes as early with this book which he puts as very late. A comparison of A and this supposedly late book will show the value of patronymics as a test of relative antiquity. Inasmuch as Nestor speaks in each book, I shall omit the references he makes to mythological characters. The following men are introduced in action or by reference in the first book of the *Iliad*: Achilles, Chryses, Agamemnon, Priam, Calchas, Ajax, Odysseus, Idomeneus, Menelaus, Hector, Nestor, Patroclus, Talthibius, Eurybates, and Aetion—15. There are in this book, omitting the mythological references made by Nestor, six patronymics: 'Ατρείδης, 'Ατρείων, Πηληιάδης, Πηλείων, Θεστορίδης, Μενoitιιάδης. Two of these are derived from Peleus and two from Atreus, hence there are but four names from which patronymics in this book are derived.

The following are introduced by action or by reference in Book xxiii of the *Iliad*: Achilles, Patroclus, Hector, Agamemnon, Amphidamas, Menoetius, Peleus, Meriones, Idomeneus, Eumelus, Diomedes, Aeneas, Menelaus, Echeolus, Antilochus, Phoenix, Ajax Telamon, Ajax Oileus, Sthenelus, Asteropaeus, Automedon, Noemon, Epeius, Euryalus, Odysseus, Thoas, Euneus, Sarpedon, Aetion, Polypoetes, Leonteus, Teucer, Nestor, Lycaon, Talthibius—35. This book has the following patronymics: 'Ατρείδης, 'Ατρείων, Πηλείδης, Πηλείων, Μενoitιιάδης, Αιακίδης, Πριαμίδης, Τυδείδης, 'Αγχισιάδης, Νηληιάδης, Νεστορίδης, Φηρητιάδης, Ταλαιονίδης, Λαερτιάδης, 'Ιησονίδης, 'Οιλιιάδης, Τελαμωνιάδης—17. The first book has fifteen names of men and six patronymics, the twenty-third book has thirty-five names of men and seventeen patronymics; hence 40 per cent have patronymics in A, nearly 50 per cent in Ψ. This is only a part of the story, since those who have no patronymic in the latter book are for the most part obscure characters, while in the earlier book such heroes as Nestor, Ajax, Hector, and Odysseus have no patronymic. Each of these appears in book twenty-three and each has a patronymic in that book. A simple statement of the names and patronymics found in these two books shows that Book xxiii is older than Book i, if patronymics are to be the sole test of antiquity. It is passing strange that in "De dissertatione probanda ad ordinem philosophorum" and at the "Examen rigorosum" it never came into the mind of anyone to look at the facts.

CONCLUSION

The *Iliad* abounds in patronymics since it has so many royal and heroic actors, while the *Odyssey* has hardly more than one powerful and princely figure, and he during most of the poem is a wanderer or beggar in disguise, so there are comparatively few occasions for using a patronymic. Eumaeus and Philoetius are excluded because of their humble station, the suitors, in general, because of their ignoble character. The fact, so stressed by Meyer, that Telemachus has no patronymic, is true to Homeric usage; Odysseus is the hero of the poem and as such is not ready to assume the superannuated relations of fathering a patronymic; Nestor, Laertes, Priam, and Agenor are the only actors of the poems to take this emeritus rank. Orestes is referred to as Agamemnonides (*a* 30), but Agamemnon was then dead. The son of Hector is called (Z 401) Ἐκτοριδὲν ἀγαπητόν, where, even if the form be that of a patronymic, the meaning is clearly that of a diminutive, "lovely little Hector." Telemachus is too old to endure the diminutive, Odysseus too young to allow him the patronymic. As far as patronymics are concerned all parts of Homer reflect the same stage of linguistic development, the shift in frequency of occurrence depends on the needs of poetry and not on a change in function. Nowhere in Homer is the patronymic obligatory, but it is throughout subject to the vague and indefinite dictates of poetic feeling.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY